

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and further examination are requested. Upon entry of this amendment, the specification is amended, the abstract is amended, claims 1-7, 9 and 11-17 are amended, and claim 10 is cancelled, leaving claim 1-9 and 11-17 pending with claim 1 being independent. No new matter has been added.

Specification

The specification and abstract have been carefully reviewed and revised to correct grammatical and idiomatic errors in order to aid the Examiner in further consideration of the application. No new matter has been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yano (EP 1,136,973) in view of Jarnebrick et al. (US 6,630,228).

Applicants submit that the claims as now pending are allowable over the cited prior art. Specifically, amended independent claim 1 now recites a display window protection panel for an electronic apparatus, the protection panel comprising a decorating film including a transparent hard coating film and a window forming layer, the hard coating film including a first surface and a second surface, the window forming layer having a first portion and a second portion, the first portion being a decorating portion formed in a thin film state in a portion of the first surface of the hard coating film, and the second portion being a part where the decorating portion is not formed and being formed as a transparent window portion arranged so that a portion of a display device exposed by a display window opening can be viewed, the hard coating film being a hard coating processed layer formed on at least one surface of a transparent resin film, and a transparent sticking layer configured to stick the decorating film to a second surface of the transparent protective plate in a laminated state.

The cited prior art fails to disclose or render obvious such a panel. In particular, Yano discloses that a hard coat film formed on a glass substrate is a coating film. Such a coating film is formed on the glass substrate by dipping, spin-coating, spraying, flow coating, and knife coating. *See* Yano paragraph [0052]. Additionally, Yano discloses that the hard coating film 3 can be

formed by hot stamping. Yano proceeds to discuss hot stamping in paragraph [0055], stating that hot stamping is intended to transfer a decorative material to the cover glass substrate 2 with the aid of heat and pressure from a foil coated with the decorative material. This procedure enables an efficient production of hard coating film 3 and also permits transfer to a curved surface.

Yano also discusses, in paragraph [0056], that one method of hot stamping is inmolding transfer. Yano states that this method consists of injection-molding the cover glass substrate 2 in a mold in which a transfer foil printed with decorative material is arranged before each molding cycle. This method is efficient because it permits molding and hot stamping simultaneously and eliminates the secondary step for hot stamping. As with the method discussed above, this method permits transfer to a curved surface.

However, Yano does not disclose that the hard coating film is a hard coating processed layer formed on at least one of the surfaces of a transparent resin film, as required by claim 1 of the present application. Therefore, Yano fails to disclose each element of independent claim 1.

Furthermore, the Examiner contends that the Yano primer layer is the transparent sticking layer on the surface of the transparent protective plate. Even assuming such, Yano still fails to disclose that this primer layer (6) has a sticking property, since Yano merely discloses that “The cover glass 1b of the second embodiment is characterized in that the primer layer 6 improves adhesion of the hard coating film 3 and the anti-reflection coating 4 to the cover glass substrate 2 of transparent plastics, thereby improving the shock resistance of the cover glass 1”. See paragraph [0072] of Yano. Therefore, it is clear that Yano merely discloses that when the hard coating film 3 is formed on the primer layer 6, the adhesion property between the hard coating film 3 and the primer layer 6 is improved.

However, as recited in claim 1 of the present invention, the transparent sticking layer is configured to stick the decorating film to a second surface of the transparent protective plate in a laminated state. Yano fails to disclose this element.

Moreover, Jarnebrick fails to overcome these deficiencies of Yano. Jarnebrick discloses a window frame-shaped printing layer coated on a protective film and a resin three-dimensionally coated on the window frame-shaped printing layer for absorbing any shock, resulting in obtaining a resin-frame attached protective film. Such a resin-frame attached protective film is significantly distinct from the cover glass of Yano, such that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have combined these references to arrive at the present invention, as recited in

independent claim 1. Additionally, even assuming one of ordinary skill in the art would have combined these references, such a combination would not have resulted in the invention recited in independent claim 1 of the present application.

Moreover, there is no reasoning in the prior art to modify Jarnebrick or Yano, such that the combination thereof would have rendered independent claim 1 obvious. Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable over the cited prior art.

Claims 5-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yano and Jarnebrick in view of Keiichi (JP 2002-072214).

Applicants submit that since each of these claims is dependent from independent claim 1, and since Keiichi fails to overcome the deficiencies of the combination of Yano and Jarnebrick discussed above, each of these claims is allowable over the cited prior art for the reasons set forth above.

Claims 9 and 11-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yano and Jarnebrick in view of Tanube (US 7,014,916). Claims 14-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yano, Jarnebrick, and Keiichi, in view of Tanube.

Applicants submit that since each of these claims is dependent from independent claim 1, and since Tanube fails to overcome the deficiencies of the combination of Yano and Jarnebrick (and Keiichi) discussed above, each of these claims is allowable over the cited prior art for the reasons set forth above. Moreover, even assuming that the hard coating film-attached cover glass of Yano could have been positioned on the resistive film type touch panel of Tanabe to serve as the uppermost layer of the hard coating film, it would have been difficult to elastically deform the cover glass. Thus, a touch panel input operation of an electric device could not have been performed through the cover glass. Furthermore, if the resistive film touch panel of Tanabe were placed on the hard coating film-attached cover glass of Yano, the hard coating film would have been rendered meaningless. Thus, Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have combined Tanube with Yano and Jarnebrick (and Keiichi) to render these claims obvious.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all of the claims now pending in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe there are any remaining issues that must be resolved before this application can be allowed, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Yasuji KUSUDA et al.

/Jeffrey J. Howell/

By 2010.05.07 13:29:57 -04'00'

Jeffrey J. Howell

Registration No. 46,402

Attorney for Applicants

JJH/ekb
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
May 7, 2010